arXiv:math/0210233v1 [math.DG] 16 Oct 2002

KLEINIAN GROUPS WHICH ARE ALMOST FUCHSIAN

FRANCIS BONAHON

Abstract. We consider the space of all quasifuchsian metrics on the product of a surface with the real line. We show that, in a neighborhood of the submanifold consisting of fuchsian metrics, every non-fuchsian metric is completely determined by the bending data of its convex core.

Let S be a surface of finite topological type, obtained by removing finitely many points from a compact surface without boundary, and with negative Euler characteristic. We consider complete hyperbolic metrics on the product $S \times]-\infty, \infty[$.

The simplest ones are the fuchsian metrics defined as follows. Because of our hypothesis that the Euler characteristic of S is negative, S admits a finite area hyperbolic metric, for which S is isometric to the quotient of the hyperbolic plane $\mathbb{H}^2$ by a discrete group Γ of isometries. The group Γ uniquely extends to a group of isometries of the hyperbolic 3–space $\mathbb{H}^3$ respecting the transverse orientation of $\mathbb{H}^2 \subset \mathbb{H}^3$, for which the quotient $\mathbb{H}^3/\Gamma$ has a natural identification with $S \times]-\infty, \infty[$. A *fuchsian metric* is any metric on $S \times]-\infty, \infty[$ obtained in this way. Note that the image of $\mathbb{H}^2$ in $\mathbb{H}^3$ provides in this case a totally geodesic surface in $S \times]-\infty, \infty[$, isometric to the original metric on S.

These examples can be perturbed to more complex hyperbolic metrics on $S \times]-\infty, \infty[$. See for instance [Th1][Mas]. A *quasifuchsian metric* on $S \times]-\infty, \infty[$ is one which is obtained by quasi-conformal deformation of a fuchsian metric. Equivalently, a quasifuchsian metric is a geometrically finite hyperbolic metric on $S \times]-\infty, \infty[$ whose cusps exactly correspond to the ends of S. These also correspond to the interior points in the space of all hyperbolic metrics on $S \times]-\infty, \infty[$ for which the ends of S are parabolic [Mar][Su].

If m is a quasifuchsian metric on $S \times]-\infty, \infty[$, the totally geodesic copy of S which occurred in the fuchsian case is replaced by the *convex core* $C(m)$, defined as the smallest non-empty closed m–convex subset of $S \times]-\infty, \infty[$. If m is not fuchsian, $C(m)$ is 3–dimensional and its boundary consists of two copies of S, each facing an end of $S \times]-\infty, \infty[$. The geometry of $\partial C(m)$ was investigated by Thurston [Th1]; see also [EpM]. The component of $\partial C(m)$ that faces the end $S \times \{+\infty\}$ is a pleated surface, totally geodesic almost everywhere, but bent along a family of simple geodesics; this bending is described and quantified by a measured geodesic lamination $\beta^+(m)$ on S. Similarly, the bending of the negative component of $\partial C(m)$, namely the one facing $S \times \{-\infty\}$, is determined by a measured geodesic lamination $\beta^-(m)$.

If $\mathcal{Q}(S)$ denotes the space of isotopy classes of quasifuchsian metrics on $S \times]-\infty, \infty[$ and if $\mathcal{ML}(S)$ is the space of measured geodesic laminations on S, the

Date: February 1, 2008.

This work was partially supported by grant DMS-0103511 from the National Science Foundation.

rule $m \mapsto (\beta^+(m), \beta^-(m))$ defines a map $\beta : \mathcal{Q}(S) \to \mathcal{ML}(S) \times \mathcal{ML}(S)$. By definition, $\beta(m) = (0,0)$ is the metric m is fuchsian, in which case the convex core $C(m)$ is just a totally m–geodesic copy of S. The image $\beta(m) \in \mathcal{ML}(S)^2$, interpreted as a measured geodesic lamination on two copies of S, is the *bending measured geodesic lamination* of the quasifuchsian metric m.

The space $\mathcal{Q}(S)$ is a manifold of dimension 2θ where, if $\chi(S)$ is the Euler characteristic of S and p is its number of ends, $\theta = -3\chi(S) - p \geqslant 0$. It contains the space $\mathcal{F}(S)$ as a proper submanifold of dimension θ. To some extend, the bending measured lamination $\beta(m)$ measures how far the metric $m \in \mathcal{Q}(S)$ is from being fuchsian. Finally, recall that the space $\mathcal{ML}(S)$ of measured geodesic laminations is a piecewise linear manifold of dimension θ.

Thurston conjectured that the restriction of the bending map to β could be used to parametrize $\mathcal{Q}(S) - \mathcal{F}(S)$, namely that it induces a homeomorphism between $\mathcal{Q}(S) - \mathcal{F}(S)$ and an open subset of $\mathcal{ML}(S)^2$. The image of β was determined in [BoO].

The goal of the current paper is to prove Thurston's conjecture on a neighborhood of the space of Fuchsian metrics.

Theorem 1. *There exists an open neighborhood V of the fuchsian submanifold $\mathcal{F}(S)$ in $\mathcal{Q}(S)$ such that the bending map $\beta : \mathcal{Q}(S) \to \mathcal{ML}(S)^2$ induces a homeomorphism between $V - \mathcal{F}(S)$ and its image.*

There are well-known restrictions for $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{ML}(S)^2$ to be in the image of β; see for instance [BoO]. In particular, if $(\mu, \nu) \neq (0,0)$ is the bending measured lamination of some $m \in \mathcal{Q}(S)$, then the measured geodesic laminations μ and ν must *fill up* the surface S, in the sense that every non-trivial measured geodesic lamination has non-zero geometric intersection number with at least one of μ, ν. This is equivalent to the condition that every component of $S - \mu \cup \nu$ is, either a topological disk bounded by the union of finitely many geodesic arcs, or a topological annulus bounded on one side by the union of finitely many geodesic arcs and going to a cusp on the other side.

Let $\mathcal{FML}(S)$ denote the open subset of $\mathcal{ML}(S)^2$ consisting of those (μ, ν) where μ and ν fill up S. Note that $\mathcal{FML}(S)$ is endowed with an action of $\mathbb{R}^+$, defined by $t(\mu, \nu) = (t\mu, t\nu)$, which decomposes $\mathcal{FML}(S)$ as the union of pairwise disjoint rays (=orbits) $]0, \infty[\,(\mu, \nu)$.

Theorem 2. *In Theorem 1, the neighborhood V of $\mathcal{F}(S)$ and its image $U = \beta(V)$ can be chosen so that $U - \{(0,0)\}$ is an open subset of $\mathcal{FML}(S)$ which intersects each ray $]0, \infty[\,(\mu, \nu)$ in an interval $]0, \varepsilon_{\mu\nu}[\,(\mu, \nu)$.*

Theorems 1 and 2 are proved later as Theorem 14. The main idea of the proof is to construct an inverse $\beta^{-1} : U - \{(0,0)\} \to V - \mathcal{F}(S)$, and splits into two steps: an infinitesimal part, and a transversality argument based on the infinitesimal part. The infinitesimal part is now relatively classical; see for instance [Se1]. There are restrictions on which bending data can be realized by an infinitesimal deformation of $m_0 \in \mathcal{F}(S)$. Through the complex structure of $\mathcal{Q}(S)$, where multiplication by $\mathrm{i} = \sqrt{-1}$ converts bending to shearing, these restrictions can be expressed in a purely 2–dimensional context; see Section 2. The main part of the proof is to show by a transversality argument that any infinitesimal bending data can actually be realized by a deformation. The only significant idea of the paper is to apply the transversality argument, not in $\mathcal{Q}(S)$ where the necessary hypotheses are not

realized, but in the manifold-with-boundary $\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$ obtained by blowing up $\mathcal{Q}(S)$ along the fuchsian submanifold $\mathcal{F}(S)$.

Switching to the blow-up manifold $\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$ actually provides a better understanding of the restriction of β on a neighborhood of $\mathcal{F}(S)$ and of its inverse. See Theorem 13 for a precise statement.

Acknowledgements: There is strong evidence that the content of this paper has been known to Bill Thurston for about twenty years. I personally learned much of the material of Section 2 many years ago from David Epstein who, I believe, had learned it from Thurston. I am also grateful to Pete Storm and Dick Canary for helping me to clarify my thoughts.

1. The earthquake section

We consider the *Teichmüller space* $\mathcal{T}(S)$, namely the space of isotopy classes of finite area complete hyperbolic metrics on the surface S. Recall that $\mathcal{T}(S)$ is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^\theta$, where $\theta = -3\chi(S) - p \geqslant 0$ if $\chi(S)$ is the Euler characteristic of S and p is its number of ends.

A standard deformation of a metric $m \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ is the *left earthquake* $E^\mu_m \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ along the measured geodesic lamination μ, as constructed in [Th2][Ke1][EpM]. We consider the *infinitesimal left earthquake vector* $e^\mu_m = \frac{d}{dt} E^{t\mu}_m{}_{|t=0} \in T_m\mathcal{T}(S)$. This provides a section $e^\mu : \mathcal{T}(S) \to T\mathcal{T}(S)$ of the tangent bundle of $\mathcal{T}(S)$, defined by $m \mapsto e^\mu_m$.

There similarly exists a *right earthquake* $E^{-\mu}_m$ along μ; the notation is justified by the fact that $m \mapsto E^{-\mu}_m$ is the inverse of $m \mapsto E^\mu_m$. We can then consider the *infinitesimal right earthquake vector* $e^{-\mu}_m = \frac{d}{dt} E^{-t\mu}_m{}_{|t=0} \in T_m\mathcal{T}(S)$ and the corresponding section $e^{-\mu} : \mathcal{T}(S) \to T\mathcal{T}(S)$ of the tangent bundle of $\mathcal{T}(S)$. Note that $e^{-\mu}_m = -e^\mu_m$, but it will be convenient to keep a separate notation.

Recall that the measured geodesic laminations $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{ML}(S)$ *fill up* the surface S if every non-trivial measured geodesic lamination has non-zero geometric intersection number with at least one of μ, ν. This is equivalent to the condition that every component of $S - \mu \cup \nu$ is, either a topological disk bounded by the union of finitely many geodesic arcs, or a topological annulus bounded on one side by the union of finitely many geodesic arcs and going to a cusp on the other side.

Proposition 3. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{ML}(S)$ be two non-zero measured geodesic laminations. The intersection of the two sections e^μ, $e^{-\nu} : \mathcal{T}(S) \to T\mathcal{T}(S)$ of the tangent bundle of $\mathcal{T}(S)$ is transverse. These sections meet in exactly one point if μ and ν fill up the surface S, and are otherwise disjoint.*

Proof. We first translate the problem in terms of the length functions l_μ, $l_\nu : \mathcal{T}(S) \to \mathbb{R}$ which to a metric $m \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ associate the m–lengths of the measured geodesic lamination μ and ν. The Weil-Petersson symplectic form on $\mathcal{T}(S)$ induces an isomorphism between its tangent bundle $T\mathcal{T}(S)$ and its cotangent bundle $T^*\mathcal{T}(S)$. A celebrated result of Scott Wolpert [Wo1] asserts that this isomorphism sends the section e^μ of $T\mathcal{T}(S)$ to the section dl_μ of $T^*\mathcal{T}(S)$. Therefore, Proposition 3 is equivalent to showing that the sections dl_μ and $-dl_\nu$ transversely meet in 1 or 0 point, according to whether μ and ν fill up the surface S or not.

First consider the case where μ and ν fill up S. The intersection of the section dl_μ and $-dl_\nu$ of $T^*\mathcal{T}(S)$ correspond to the points $m \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ where $d_m l_\mu = -d_m l_\nu$, namely to the critical points of the function $l_\mu + l_\nu : \mathcal{T}(S) \to \mathbb{R}$. It is proved in

[Ke1][Ke2] that, because μ and ν fill up S, the function $l_\mu + l_\nu$ admits a unique critical point m_0. In addition, the hessian of $l_\mu + l_\nu$ at m_0 is positive definite [Wo2][Ke2].

Let $u = d_{m_0} l_\mu = -d_{m_0} l_\nu \in T^*_{m_0}\mathcal{T}(S)$. The intersection of the tangent spaces of the sections dl_μ and $-dl_\nu$ at u consists of all the vectors of the form $T_{m_0}(dl_\mu)(v) = T_{m_0}(-dl_\nu)(v)$ for some $v \in T_{m_0}\mathcal{T}(S)$, where $T_{m_0}(dl_\mu)$, $T_{m_0}(-dl_\nu) : T_{m_0}\mathcal{T}(S) \to T_u T^*\mathcal{T}(S)$ denote the tangent maps of the sections dl_μ, $-dl_\nu : \mathcal{T}(S) \to T^*\mathcal{T}(S)$.

Note that, for an arbitrary $w \in T_{m_0}\mathcal{T}(S)$, the vectors $T_{m_0}(dl_\mu)(w)$ and $T_{m_0}(-dl_\nu)(w)$ both project to w through the tangent map of the projection $T^*\mathcal{T}(S) \to \mathcal{T}(S)$. In particular, the difference $T_{m_0}(dl_\mu)(w) - T_{m_0}(-dl_\nu)(w)$ is tangent to the fiber, namely is an element of $T^*_{m_0}\mathcal{T}(S) \subset T_u T^*\mathcal{T}(S)$. Using local coordinates, one easily sees that this difference is the image of w under the homomorphism $T_{m_0}\mathcal{T}(S) \to T^*_{m_0}\mathcal{T}(S)$ induced by the hessian of the function $l_\mu + l_\nu$. (Beware of optimistic simplifications, though: for instance, $T_{m_0}(-dl_\nu)$ is not the same as $-T_{m_0}(dl_\nu)$ since they take their values in different tangent spaces.) Since the hessian is non-degenerate, this homomorphism is actually an isomorphism.

A consequence of this analysis is that, if $T_{m_0}(dl_\mu)(v) = T_{m_0}(-dl_\nu)(v)$, then v must be 0. Therefore, the intersection of the two sections dl_μ and $-dl_\nu$ of $T^*\mathcal{T}(S)$ at the point u is transverse, since these sections have dimension θ and the total space $T^*\mathcal{T}(S)$ has dimension 2θ. By Weil-Petersson duality, this proves that the sections e^μ of $e^{-\nu}$ of $T\mathcal{T}(S)$ have a transverse intersection consisting of exactly one point.

We now consider the case where μ and ν do not fill up the surface. In this case, the function $l_\mu + l_\nu$ has no critical point [Ke2] (see also the discussion in [Se1, §4.2]). By the above translation, it follows that the sections e^μ, $e^{-\nu}$ are disjoint.

This concludes the proof of Proposition 3. □

If the measured geodesic laminations μ, ν fill up the surface S, let $\kappa(\mu, \nu)$ denote the (unique) critical point of the length function $l_\mu + l_\nu : \mathcal{T}(S) \to \mathbb{R}$. As above, $\kappa(\mu, \nu)$ is also the unique $m \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ such that $e^\mu_m = e^{-\nu}_m$.

Lemma 4. *If $\kappa(\mu', \nu) = \kappa(\mu, \nu)$, then $\mu' = \mu$.*

Proof. By an (easy) infinitesimal version of [Th2] (see also [Ke2]), an infinitesimal left earthquake completely determines the measured geodesic lamination along which it is performed. If $e^{\mu'}_m = e^{-\nu}_m = e^\mu_m$, it follows that $\mu' = \mu$. □

We will need a result similar to Proposition 3 in the unit tangent bundle $T^1\mathcal{T}(S)$. Recall that the fibers $T^1_m\mathcal{T}(S)$ of this bundle are the quotient of $T_m\mathcal{T}(S) - \{0\}$ under the equivalence relation which identifies v to tv when $t \in]0, \infty[$. In particular, $T^1\mathcal{T}(S)$ is a manifold of dimension $2\theta - 1$. Let $\overline{e}^\mu$, $\overline{e}^{-\nu} : \mathcal{T}(S) \to T^1\mathcal{T}(S)$ be the sections induced by e^μ and $e^{-\nu}$.

Proposition 5. *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{ML}(S)$ be two non-zero measured geodesic laminations. The intersection of the two sections $\overline{e}^\mu$, $\overline{e}^{-\nu} : \mathcal{T}(S) \to T^1\mathcal{T}(S)$ of the unit tangent bundle of $\mathcal{T}(S)$ is transverse. If μ and ν fill up the surface S, these sections meet along a section above a line $K(\mu, \nu)$ properly embedded in $\mathcal{T}(S)$. If μ, ν do not fill up S, the intersection is empty.*

Proof. The two sections meet above $m \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ if $\overline{e}^\mu_m = \overline{e}^{-\nu}_m$, namely if there is a $t > 0$ such that $e^{-\nu}_m = t e^\mu_m = e^{t\mu}_m$. By Proposition 3, this can occur only when $t\mu$

and ν fill the surface, namely only when μ and ν fill the surface. Consequently, the two sections have empty intersection if μ and ν do not fill up the surface.

If μ and ν fill up the surface then, for every $t > 0$, Proposition 3 shows that there is a unique $m = \kappa(t\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ such that $e^{t\mu}_m = e^{-\nu}_m$. As a consequence, the two sections $\overline{e}^{\mu}$, $\overline{e}^{-\nu} : \mathcal{T}(S) \to T^1\mathcal{T}(S)$ meet exactly above the image $K(\mu, \nu)$ of the map $]0, \infty[\to \mathcal{T}(S)$ defined by $t \mapsto \kappa(t\mu, \nu)$.

If $m = \kappa(t\mu, \nu)$ so that $e^{t\mu}_m = e^{-\nu}_m$, the tangent space $T_{e^{t\mu}_m} T\mathcal{T}(S)$ is the sum of the tangent spaces $T_m e^{t\mu}(T_m\mathcal{T}(S))$ and $T_m e^{-\nu}(T_m\mathcal{T}(S))$ of the sections $e^{t\mu}$ and $e^{-\nu}$, by the transversality property of Proposition 3. Therefore, in the unit tangent bundle, the tangent space $T_{\overline{e}^{\mu}_m} T^1\mathcal{T}(S)$ is the sum of $T_m\overline{e}^{\mu}(T_m\mathcal{T}(S))$ and $T_m\overline{e}^{-\nu}(T_m\mathcal{T}(S))$. As a consequence, the intersection of the two sections $\overline{e}^{\mu}$ and $\overline{e}^{-\nu}$ is transverse above the point $m = \kappa(t\mu, \nu)$.

By transversality, the intersection of the sections is a submanifold of the image of $\overline{e}^{\mu}$. Its dimension is equal to 1, by consideration of the dimensions of $\mathcal{T}(S)$ and $T^1\mathcal{T}(S)$. Since the projection $\overline{e}^{\mu}(\mathcal{T}(S)) \to \mathcal{T}(S)$ is a diffeomorphism, it follows that the projection $K(\mu, \nu)$ of this projection is a 1–dimensional submanifold of $\mathcal{T}(S)$.

By definition, $\kappa(t\mu, \nu)$ is the unique minimum of the convex function $tdl_\mu + dl_\nu$, which has positive hessian at this minimum. It follows that $\kappa(t\mu, \nu)$ is a continuous function of t. Conversely, t is completely determined by $m = \kappa(t\mu, \nu)$ by Lemma 4. As a consequence, if $m = \kappa(t\mu, \nu)$ stays in a bounded subset of $\mathcal{T}(S)$, then t stays in a compact subset of $]0, \infty[$. In other words, the map $]0, \infty[\to \mathcal{T}(S)$ defined by $t \mapsto \kappa(t\mu, \nu)$ is injective, continuous and proper. It follows that its image $K(\mu, \nu)$, which we already know is a 1–dimensional submanifold of $\mathcal{T}(S)$, is a line properly embedded in $\mathcal{T}(S)$. □

Following the terminology of [Se1] (motivated by [Ke2]), let the *Kerckhoff line* be the proper 1–dimensional submanifold $K(\mu, \nu) \subset \mathcal{T}(S)$, consisting of all the $\kappa(t\mu, \nu)$ with $t > 0$.

2. Necessary condition for small bending

Let $t \mapsto m_t$, $t \in [0, \varepsilon[$, be a small differentiable curve in $\mathcal{Q}(S)$. If $\beta(m_t) = (\beta^+(t), \beta^-(t)) \in \mathcal{ML}(S)^2$ is its bending measured geodesic lamination, it is shown in [Bo3] that the right derivative $\frac{d}{dt^+}\beta(m_t)_{|t=0}$ exists, as an element of the tangent space of $\mathcal{ML}(S)^2$ at $\beta(m_0)$. In general, because $\mathcal{ML}(S)$ is not a differentiable manifold, this tangent space consists of geodesic laminations with a transverse structure which is less regular than a transverse measure [Bo2]. However, if we assume in addition that the starting point m_0 of the curve is fuchsian, the tangent space of $\mathcal{ML}(S)^2$ at $\beta(m_0) = (0, 0)$ is just $\mathcal{ML}(S)^2$; see [Bo2].

We can therefore consider the converse problem: Given a fuchsian metric $m_0 \in \mathcal{F}(S)$ and a pair $(\mu, \nu) \in \mathcal{ML}(S)^2$ of measured geodesic laminations, does there exist a small differentiable curve $t \mapsto m_t \in \mathcal{Q}(S)$, $t \in [0, \varepsilon[$, originating from m_0 and such that $\frac{d}{dt^+}\beta(m_t)_{|t=0} = (\mu, \nu)$? The following result shows that m_0 is completely determined by μ and ν.

Note that, by construction, there is a natural identification between the submanifold $\mathcal{F}(S) \subset \mathcal{Q}(S)$ consisting of all fuchsian metrics and the Teichmüller space $\mathcal{T}(S)$.

Proposition 6. *Let μ, $\nu \in \mathcal{ML}(S)$ be two measured geodesic laminations, and let $t \mapsto m_t$, $t \in [0, \varepsilon[$ be a differentiable curve in $\mathcal{Q}(S)$, originating from a fuchsian metric m_0 and such that the derivative $\frac{d}{dt^+}\beta(m_t)_{|t=0}$ of the bending measured lamination is equal to (μ, ν). Then μ and ν fill up the surface S, and $m_0 \in \mathcal{F}(S) = \mathcal{T}(S)$ is equal to the minimum $\kappa(\mu, \nu)$ of the length function $l_\mu + l_\nu : \mathcal{T}(S) \to \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. We consider two other curves in $\mathcal{Q}(S)$.

The first one is the *pure bending* $t \mapsto B^{t\mu}_{m_0}$, obtained by bending the surface S along the measured geodesic lamination $t\mu$ while keeping the metric induced on this pleated surface equal to m_0. For $t \geqslant 0$ small enough, $B^{t\mu}_{m_0}$ is a quasifuchsian metric for which the positive side of the boundary $\partial C(B^{t\mu}_{m_0})$ is a pleated surface with induced metric m_0 and with bending measured geodesic lamination $t\mu$. See [EpM, §3] or [Bo1] for the construction of $B^{t\mu}_{m_0}$, and [Mar, §9] to guarantee that it is quasifuchsian for t sufficiently small. In addition, it is proved in [EpM, §3.9] [Bo1] that this curve is differentiable in $\mathcal{Q}(S)$, and in particular admits a tangent vector $b^\mu_{m_0} = \frac{d}{dt} B^{t\mu}_{m_0 |t=0} \in T_{m_0}\mathcal{Q}(S)$. This tangent vector $b^\mu_{m_0}$ is the *infinitesimal pure bending* of $m_0 \in \mathcal{F}(S)$ along the measured geodesic lamination μ.

The second curve will use the shear-bend coordinates associated, as in [Bo1], to a maximal geodesic lamination λ containing the support of μ. These coordinates provide a local parametrization of $\mathcal{Q}(S)$ in terms of the geometry of a pleated surface with pleating locus λ. Let m'_t correspond to a pleated surface whose induced metric is equal to the metric $m^+_t \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ induced on the positive component of the boundary $\partial C(m_t)$ of the convex core, and whose bending data is equal to $t\mu$. By [Mar, §9], m_t is a quasifuchsian metric for t small.

It is proved in [Bo3] that, because the curve $t \mapsto m_t$ is differentiable and because $\frac{d}{dt^+}\beta^+(m_t)_{|t=0} = \mu$, the right derivative $\dot m^+_0 = \frac{d}{dt} m^+_{t\,|t=0} \in T_{m_0}\mathcal{T}(S)$ exists and the two curves $t \mapsto m_t$ and $t \mapsto m'_t$ have the same tangent vector at $t = 0$. In particular, by differentiability of the shear-bend coordinates, the tangent vector $\dot m_0 = \frac{d}{dt} m_{t|t=0} = \frac{d}{dt} m'_{t|t=0} \in T_{m_0}\mathcal{Q}(S)$ is the sum of $b^\mu_{m_0}$ and of $\dot m^+_0 = \frac{d}{dt} m^+_{t\,|t=0} \in T_{m_0}\mathcal{T}(S) = T_{m_0}\mathcal{F}(S)$.

Similarly, bending S in the negative direction, we can define the infinitesimal pure bending vector $b^{-\nu}_{m_0} = -b^\nu_{m_0} \in T_{m_0}\mathcal{Q}(S)$ of m_0 along $-\nu$. We can also consider the metric $m^-_t \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ induced on the negative side of $\partial C(m_t)$. Then, as above, the vector $\dot m_0$ is the sum of $b^{-\nu}_{m_0}$ and of $\dot m^-_0 = \frac{d}{dt} m^-_{t\,|t=0} \in T_{m_0}\mathcal{T}(S) = T_{m_0}\mathcal{F}(S)$.

Finally, we will use the complex structure of $\mathcal{Q}(S)$ coming from the fact that the isometry group of $\mathbb{H}^3$ is $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$. Indeed, considering the holonomy of hyperbolic metrics embeds $\mathcal{Q}(S)$ into the space $\mathcal{R}(S)$ of (conjugacy classes) of representations $\pi_1(S) \to \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$. This representation space $\mathcal{R}(S)$ is a complex manifold near the image of $\mathcal{Q}(S)$, and admits this image as a complex submanifold (an open subset if S is compact). The shear-bend local coordinates are well behaved with respect to this complex structure; see [Bo1]. In particular, multiplication by $\mathrm{i} = \sqrt{-1}$ exchanges shearing and bending. We will use the following two consequences of this. First of all, at a fuchsian metric m_0, the tangent space $T_{m_0}\mathcal{Q}(S)$ is the direct sum of $T_{m_0}\mathcal{F}(S)$ and of $\mathrm{i}T_{m_0}\mathcal{F}(S)$. In addition, the infinitesimal pure bending vector $b^\mu_{m_0}$ belongs to $\mathrm{i}T_{m_0}\mathcal{F}(S)$ and is equal to $\mathrm{i}e^\mu_{m_0}$, where $e^\mu_{m_0} \in T_{m_0}\mathcal{T}(S) = T_{m_0}\mathcal{F}(S)$ is the infinitesimal earthquake vector along μ.

Applying the decomposition $T_{m_0}\mathcal{Q}(S) = T_{m_0}\mathcal{F}(S) \oplus \mathrm{i}T_{m_0}\mathcal{F}(S)$ to the vector $\dot m_0 = \dot m^+_0 + b^\mu_{m_0} = \dot m^-_0 + b^{-\nu}_{m_0}$, we conclude that $b^\mu_{m_0} = b^{-\nu}_{m_0}$. Multiplying by $-\mathrm{i}$, it

follows that $e^{\mu}_{m_0} = e^{-\nu}_{m_0}$. As in the proof of Proposition 3, this is equivalent to the property that $m_0 = \kappa(\mu, \nu)$. □

3. Realizing small bending

The goal of this section is to prove a converse to Proposition 6, by constructing in Proposition 11 a small curve of quasifuchsian metrics $t \mapsto m_t \in \mathcal{Q}(S)$, $t \in [0, \varepsilon[$, such that $\beta(m_t) = (t\mu, t\nu)$ for every t.

For the measured geodesic lamination $\mu \in \mathcal{ML}(S)$, let $\mathcal{P}^+(\mu)$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}^-(\mu)$) be the space of quasifuchsian metrics m such that the positive (resp. negative) component of the convex core boundary $\partial C(m)$ has bending measured geodesic lamination $t\mu$, for some $t \in [0, \infty[$.

Recall that $\theta = -3\chi(S) + p$ denotes the dimension of the Teichmüller space $\mathcal{T}(S)$.

Lemma 7. *The space $\mathcal{P}^{\pm}(\mu)$ is a submanifold-with-boundary of $\mathcal{Q}(S)$, with dimension $\theta + 1$ and with boundary $\mathcal{F}(S)$.*

Proof. We can use the coordinates developed in [Bo1], and associated to a maximal geodesic lamination λ containing the support of μ. These provide an open differentiable embedding $\varphi : \mathcal{Q}(S) \to \mathcal{T}(S) \times \mathcal{H}_0(\lambda; \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z})$. The first component of $\varphi(m)$ is the hyperbolic metric induced on the unique m–pleated surface f_m with pleating locus λ. The second component is the bending transverse cocycle of f_m, which belongs to the topological group $\mathcal{H}_0(\lambda; \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}) \cong (\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z})^{\theta} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/2$ of all $(\mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z})$–valued transverse cocycles for λ that satisfy a certain cusp condition. In general, the bending of the pleated surface f_m is measured by a transverse cocycle and not by a measured geodesic lamination because f_m is not necessarily locally convex.

For notational convenience, it is useful to lift φ to an embedding $\psi : \mathcal{Q}(S) \to \mathcal{T}(S) \times \mathcal{H}_0(\lambda; \mathbb{R})$, such that ψ sends $\mathcal{F}(S) \cong \mathcal{T}(S)$ to $\mathcal{T}(S) \times \{0\}$ by the identity. Here, $\mathcal{H}_0(\lambda; \mathbb{R}) \cong \mathbb{R}^{\theta}$ denotes the space of $\mathbb{R}$–valued transverse cocycle satisfying the cusp condition. Such a ψ exists and is unique because $\mathcal{Q}(S)$ is simply connected.

The vector space $\mathcal{H}_0(\lambda; \mathbb{R})$ contains the transverse measure (also denoted by μ) of the measured geodesic lamination μ, and therefore also contains the two rays $[0, \infty[\,\mu$ and $]-\infty, 0]\,\mu$, consisting of all positive (resp. negative) real multiples of μ.

We claim that $\mathcal{P}^+(\mu)$ locally corresponds, under ψ, to the intersection of $\psi(\mathcal{Q}(S))$ with $\mathcal{T}(S) \times [0, \infty[\,\mu$. Clearly, ψ sends an element of $\mathcal{P}^+(\mu)$ to $\mathcal{T}(S) \times [0, \infty[\,\mu$. Conversely, it is proved in [KaT] that the map $\eta : \mathcal{Q}(S) \to \mathcal{T}(S) \times \mathcal{ML}(S)$ which, to a quasifuchsian metric $m \in \mathcal{Q}(S)$, associates the induced metric $m^+ \in \mathcal{T}(S)$ and the bending measured lamination $\beta^+(m)$ of the positive boundary component of the convex core $C(m)$ is a local homeomorphism. In addition, interpreting the ray $[0, \infty[\,\mu$ as a subset of both $\mathcal{H}_0(\lambda; \mathbb{R})$ and $\mathcal{ML}(S)$, the local inverse for η constructed in [KaT] coincides with ψ on $\mathcal{T}(S) \times [0, \infty[\,\mu$. It follows that, if $m \in \mathcal{Q}(S)$ is sufficiently close to $m_0 \in \mathcal{P}^+(\mu)$ and if $\psi(m) \in \mathcal{T}(S) \times [0, \infty[\,\mu$, the bending measured lamination $\beta^+(\mu)$ is equal to the second component $t\mu$ of $\psi(m)$. Therefore, a metric m near $m_0 \in \mathcal{P}^+(\mu)$ is in $\mathcal{P}^+(\mu)$ if and only if $\psi(m) \in \mathcal{T}(S) \times [0, \infty[\,\mu$.

A similar property holds for $\mathcal{P}^-(\mu)$ by symmetry. Therefore, under the diffeomorphism ψ, $\mathcal{P}^+(\mu)$, $\mathcal{P}^-(\mu)$ and $\mathcal{F}(S)$ locally correspond to the intersection of $\psi(\mathcal{Q}(S))$ with $\mathcal{T}(S) \times [0, \infty[\,\mu$, $\mathcal{T}(S) \times]-\infty, 0]\,\mu$ and $\mathcal{T}(S) \times \{0\}$, respectively. □

Given two measured geodesic laminations μ, $\nu \in \mathcal{ML}(S)$, we want to consider the intersection of $\mathcal{P}^+(\mu)$ and $\mathcal{P}^-(\nu)$. Note that this intersection is far from being transverse, since these two $(\theta+1)$–dimensional submanifolds both contain the θ–dimensional submanifold $\mathcal{F}(S)$ as their boundary. For this reason, we will consider the manifold-with-boundary $\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$ obtained by blowing-up $\mathcal{Q}(S)$ along the submanifold $\mathcal{F}(S)$. Namely, $\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$ is the union of $\mathcal{Q}(S) - \mathcal{F}(S)$ and of the unit normal bundle $N^1\mathcal{F}(S)$ with the appropriate topology. Recall that the normal bundle $N\mathcal{F}(S) \to \mathcal{F}(S)$ is intrinsically defined as the bundle whose fiber $N_m\mathcal{F}(S)$ at $m \in \mathcal{F}(S)$ is the quotient $T_m\mathcal{Q}(S)/T_m\mathcal{F}(S)$, and that the fiber $N^1_m\mathcal{F}(S)$ of the unit normal bundle $N^1\mathcal{F}(S) \to \mathcal{F}(S)$ is the quotient of $N_m\mathcal{F}(S) - \{0\}$ under the multiplicative action of $\mathbb{R}^+$. Considering a tubular neighborhood of $\mathcal{F}(S)$, $\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$ is easily endowed with a natural structure of differentiable manifold with boundary $N^1\mathcal{F}(S)$.

Exploiting the complex structure of $\mathcal{Q}(S)$, identify the normal bundle $N\mathcal{F}(S)$ to $\mathrm{i}T\mathcal{F}(S)$. The inclusion map $\mathcal{P}^+(\mu) - \mathcal{F}(S) \to \mathcal{Q}(S) - \mathcal{F}(S)$ uniquely extends to an embedding $\mathcal{P}^+(\mu) \to \check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$, which to $m \in \mathcal{F}(S) = \partial\mathcal{P}^+(\mu)$ associates the unit normal vector $\overline{b}^\mu_m \in N^1\mathcal{F}(S)$ which is in the direction of the infinitesimal pure bending vector b^μ_m of m along $+\mu$. We can similarly define an embedding $\mathcal{P}^-(\nu) \to \check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$, by associating to $m \in \mathcal{F}(S)$ the unit normal vector $-\overline{b}^\nu_m \in N^1\mathcal{F}(S)$ which is in the direction of the infinitesimal pure bending vector $b^{-\nu}_m = -b^\nu_m$ of m along $-\nu$. Let $\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu)$ and $\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu) \subset \check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$ be the respective images of these embeddings.

Lemma 8. *The subspaces $\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu)$ and $\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$ are submanifolds of $\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$, with boundary contained in $\partial\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$.*

Proof. The embedding $\psi : \mathcal{Q}(S) \to \mathcal{T}(S) \times \mathcal{H}_0(\lambda;\mathbb{R})$ of the proof of Lemma 7 sends the vector b^μ_m to the vector $(0,\mu)$ in the tangent space of $\mathcal{T}(S) \times \mathcal{H}_0(\lambda;\mathbb{R})$. The result then immediately follows from the fact that ψ locally identifies $\mathcal{P}^+(\mu)$, $\mathcal{P}^-(\mu)$ and $\mathcal{T}(S)$ to $\mathcal{T}(S) \times [0,\infty[\,\mu$, $\mathcal{T}(S) \times]-\infty,0]\,\mu$ and $\mathcal{T}(S) \times \{0\}$, respectively. This proves Lemma 7. □

Proposition 9. *The boundaries $\partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu)$ and $\partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$ have a non-empty intersection if and only if μ and ν fill up the surface S. If μ and ν fill up S, the intersection of $\partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu)$ and $\partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$ in $\partial\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$ is transverse, and is equal to the image of the Kerckhoff line $K(\mu,\nu)$ under the section $m \mapsto \overline{b}^\mu_m = -\overline{b}^\nu_m \in \partial\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$.*

Proof. The diffeomorphism $T^1\mathcal{T}(S) = T^1\mathcal{F}(S) \to \mathrm{i}T^1\mathcal{F}(S) = N^1\mathcal{F}(S) = \partial\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$ defined by multiplication by i sends $\overline{e}^\mu_m$ to $\overline{b}^\mu_m$ and $\overline{e}^{-\nu}_m$ to $\overline{b}^{-\nu}_m$. This translates Proposition 9 to a simple rephrasing of Proposition 5. □

An immediate consequence of Proposition 9 is that the intersection of the two $(\theta+1)$–dimensional submanifolds $\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu)$ and $\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$ in $\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$ is transverse near the boundary $\partial\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$. In particular, the intersection $\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap \check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$ is a 2–dimensional submanifold of $\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$ near $\partial\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$, with boundary $\partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap \partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$ contained in $\partial\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$.

By definition, a metric $m \in \mathcal{P}^+(\mu) \cap \mathcal{P}^-(\nu)$ has bending measured lamination $\beta(m) = (t\mu, u\nu)$ for some t, $u \geqslant 0$. This gives a differentiable map $\pi : \mathcal{P}^+(\mu) \cap \mathcal{P}^-(\nu) \to \mathbb{R}^2$, defined by $m \mapsto (t,u)$.

Let $\check{\mathbb{R}}^2$ be obtained by blowing up $\mathbb{R}^2$ along $\{0\}$. Because $\pi^{-1}(0) = \mathcal{F}(S)$, the map π lifts to a differentiable map $\check{\pi} : \check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap \check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu) \to \check{\mathbb{R}}^2$.

Lemma 10. *The map $\check{\pi} : \check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap \check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu) \to \check{\mathbb{R}}^2$ is a local diffeomorphism near $\partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap \partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$.*

Proof. We will prove that, at any point $p_0 \in \partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap \partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$, the (linear) tangent map $T_{p_0}\check{\pi} : T_{p_0}\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap T_{p_0}\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu) \to T_{\check{\pi}(p_0)}\check{\mathbb{R}}^2$ is injective.

Let $v \in T_{p_0}\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap T_{p_0}\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$ be such that $T_{p_0}\check{\pi}(v) = 0$. Considering the map $\mathcal{P}^+(\mu) \to [0, \infty[$ which to $m \in \mathcal{P}^+(\mu)$ associates $\beta^+(m)/\mu \in [0, \infty[$ and the induced map $\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \to [0, \infty[$, we see that v must necessarily be in the tangent space of the boundary $\partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu)$. Symmetrically, it must be in $T_{p_0}\partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$. Therefore, v is tangent to the intersection $\partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap \partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$.

Let us analyze the restriction of $\check{\pi}$ to the boundary $\partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap \partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$. By Proposition 9, $\partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap \partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$ is equal to the image of the Kerckhoff line $K(\mu, \nu)$ under the section $m \mapsto \overline{b}^{\mu}_m = -\overline{b}^{\nu}_m \in \partial\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$. Recall that an element of the Kerckhoff line $K(\mu, \nu)$ is of the form $m = \kappa(t\mu, \nu)$ for some $t > 0$, which is equivalent to the property that $b^{t\mu}_m = -b^{\nu}_m$. We will also need a coordinate chart for $\check{\mathbb{R}}^2$ near $\check{\pi}(p_0)$. Noting that the image of π is contained in the quadrant $[0, \infty[^2$, we can use for this the chart $\varphi :]0, \infty[\times [0, \infty[\to \check{\mathbb{R}}^2$ defined on the interior by $(x, y) \mapsto (xy, y)$.

We claim that, if $m = \kappa(t\mu, \nu) \in K(\mu, \nu)$, then $\varphi^{-1} \circ \check{\pi}\left(\overline{b}^{\mu}_m\right)$ is just equal to $(t, 0)$. To see this, choose, in the 2–dimensional manifold $\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap \check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$, a small curve $s \mapsto \check{m}_s$, $s \in [0, \varepsilon[$, such that $\check{m}_0 = \overline{b}^{\mu}_m \in \partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap \partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$ and such that $\frac{d}{ds^+}\check{m}_{s|t=0}$ is not tangent to the boundary. The curve $s \mapsto \check{m}_s$ projects to a differentiable curve $t \mapsto m_t \in \mathcal{Q}(S)$ with $m_0 = m$. By definition of $\mathcal{P}^+(\mu)$ and $\mathcal{P}^-(\nu)$, the bending measured lamination $\beta(m_s)$ is of the form $(t(s)\mu, u(s)\nu)$ for two differentiable functions $t(s)$, and $u(s)$ with $t(0) = u(0) = 0$. Since $\frac{d}{ds^+}\check{m}_{s|t=0}$ points away from the boundary, the curve $s \mapsto m_s$ is not tangent to $\mathcal{F}(S)$ at $s = 0$, and it follows that at least one of the derivatives $t'(0)$, $u'(0)$ is non-trivial. If we apply Proposition 6, we conclude that $m = \kappa\left(t'(0)\mu, u'(0)\nu\right)$. Since $m = \kappa\left(t\mu, \nu\right)$, it follows that $t'(0)/u'(0) = t$ by Lemma 4. In particular, $t(s)/u(s)$ tends to t as s tends to 0. Therefore, $\varphi^{-1} \circ \check{\pi}\left(\overline{b}^{\mu}_m\right)$, which is the limit of $\varphi^{-1} \circ \check{\pi}\left(\check{m}_s\right) = \varphi^{-1} \circ \pi\left(m_s\right) = \varphi^{-1} \circ \big(t(s), u(s)\big) = \big(t(s)/u(s), u(s)\big)$ as $s > 0$ tends to 0, is equal to $(t, 0)$.

This computation shows that the restriction of $\check{\pi}$ to the boundary $\partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap \partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image. In particular, if $v \in T_{p_0}\partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap T_{p_0}\partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$ is such that $T_{p_0}\check{\pi}(v) = 0$, then necessarily $v = 0$.

This concludes the proof that the tangent map $T_{p_0}\check{\pi} : T_{p_0}\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap T_{p_0}\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu) \to T_{\check{\pi}(p_0)}\check{\mathbb{R}}^2$ is injective. Since $\check{\pi}$ sends the boundary of the 2-dimensional manifold $\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap \check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$ to the boundary of the 2-dimensional manifold $\check{\mathbb{R}}^2$, this proves that $\check{\pi} : \check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap \check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu) \to \check{\mathbb{R}}^2$ is a local diffeomorphism near $p_0 \in \partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap \partial\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$. □

This immediately gives the following converse to Proposition 6.

Proposition 11. *Let μ, $\nu \in \mathcal{ML}(S)$ be two measured geodesic laminations which fill up the surface S, and let m_0 be the minimum $\kappa(\mu, \nu)$ of the length function $l_\mu + l_\nu$. Then there is a small differentiable curve $t \mapsto m_t \in \mathcal{Q}(S)$, $t \in [0, \varepsilon[$, beginning at m_0 and such that the bending measured lamination $\beta(m_t)$ is equal to $(t\mu, t\nu)$ for every t.*

Proof. Consider the curve $t \mapsto (t, t)$, $t \in [0, \varepsilon[$, in $\mathbb{R}^2$. By Lemma 10, for ε small enough, there is a curve $t \mapsto \check{m}_t \in \check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu) \cap \check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$ such that $t \mapsto \check{\pi}\left(\check{m}_t\right)$ coincides

with the lift of $t \mapsto (t,t)$ to $\check{\mathbb{R}}^2$. By definition of the map π, this just means that the projection $m_t \in \mathcal{Q}(S)$ of $\check{m}_t \in \check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$ is such that $\beta(m_t) = (t\mu, t\nu)$. □

4. Parametrizing quasi-fuchsian groups by their small bending

Recall that $\mathcal{FML}(S)$ denotes the open subset of $\mathcal{ML}(S)^2$ consisting of those pairs (μ,ν) such that μ and ν fill up the surface S.

Let $\check{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{ML}(S)$ be obtained by blowing up $\mathcal{FML}(S) \cup \{(0,0)\}$ along $\{(0,0)\}$. Namely, $\check{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{ML}(S)$ is formally obtained from $\mathcal{FML}(S)$ by extending each ray $]0,\infty[\,(\mu,\nu)$ to a semi-open ray $[0,\infty[\,(\mu,\nu)$, with the obvious topology. Note that the boundary $\partial\check{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{ML}(S)$ is just the quotient space of $\mathcal{FML}(S)$ under the multiplicative action of $\mathbb{R}^+$.

For every $(\mu,\nu) \in \mathcal{FML}(S)$, Proposition 11 provides a maximal ray $R_{\mu\nu} = [0,\varepsilon_{\mu\nu}[\,(\mu,\nu)$ in $\mathcal{FML}(S) \cup \{(0,0)\}$ and a differentiable map $\Phi_{\mu\nu} : R_{\mu\nu} \to Q(S)$ such that $\Phi_{\mu\nu}(\mu',\nu')$ has bending measured lamination (μ',ν') for every $(\mu',\nu') \in R_{\mu\nu}$ and such that $\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu)$ and $\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$ meet transversely along $\beta(R_{\mu\nu})$. Here, the statement that $R_{\mu\nu}$ is maximal means that $\varepsilon_{\mu\nu} \in]0,\infty]$ is maximal for this property.

Note that $R_{\mu\nu}$ and $\varphi_{\mu\nu}$ depend only on the orbit of (μ,ν) under the action of $\mathbb{R}^+$, namely on the corresponding point of $\partial\check{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{ML}(S)$. Let $\check{R}_{\mu\nu}$ be the lift of $R_{\mu\nu}$ in $\check{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{ML}(S)$, and lift $\Phi_{\mu\nu}$ to $\check{\Phi}_{\mu\nu} : \check{R}_{\mu\nu} \to \check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$. In particular, $\check{\Phi}_{\mu\nu}$ sends the initial point of $\check{R}_{\mu\nu}$ to the bending vector $\overline{b}^{\,\mu}_m = \overline{b}^{\,-\nu}_m \in N^1\mathcal{F}(S) = \partial\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$ with $m = \kappa(\mu,\nu)$.

Let $\check{U} \subset \check{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{ML}(S)$ denote the union of all the $\check{R}_{\mu\nu}$, and let $\check{\Phi} : \check{U} \to \mathcal{FML}(S)$ restrict to $\check{\Phi}_{\mu\nu}$ on each $\check{R}_{\mu\nu}$. Note that the property that $\Phi_{\mu\nu}(\mu',\nu')$ has bending measured lamination (μ',ν') implies that the $\check{R}_{\mu\nu}$ are pairwise disjoint, so that $\check{\Phi}$ is well-defined. We want to show that $\check{\Phi}$ is continuous.

Lemma 12. *As the measured geodesic lamination μ tends to μ_0 for the topology of $\mathcal{ML}(S)$, the submanifold $\mathcal{P}^\pm(\mu)$ tends to $\mathcal{P}^\pm(\mu_0)$ for the topology of C^∞ convergence on compact subsets.*

Proof. We will use the tools developed in [Bo1].

Let $\mu_n \in \mathcal{ML}(S)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, be a sequence converging to μ_0. Let λ_n be a maximal geodesic lamination containing the support of μ_n. Passing to a subsequence if necessary, we can assume that, for the Hausdorff topology, the geodesic lamination λ_n converges to a geodesic lamination λ_0, which is necessarily maximal and contains the support of μ_0.

The shear-bend coordinates associated to λ_n provide an open biholomorphic embedding $\Phi_n : \mathcal{Q}(S) \to \mathcal{H}_0(\lambda_n; \mathbb{C}/2\pi\mathrm{i}\mathbb{Z})$. Here $\mathcal{H}_0(\lambda_n; \mathbb{C}/2\pi\mathrm{i}\mathbb{Z})$ is the topological group of $\mathbb{C}/2\pi\mathrm{i}\mathbb{Z}$–valued transverse cocycles for the maximal geodesic lamination λ_n which satisfy the cusp condition, and is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{C}/2\pi\mathrm{i}\mathbb{Z})^\theta \oplus \mathbb{Z}/2$. For a metric $m \in \mathcal{Q}(S)$, the real part of $\Phi_n(m) \in \mathcal{H}_0(\lambda_n; \mathbb{C}/2\pi\mathrm{i}\mathbb{Z}) = \mathcal{H}_0(\lambda_n; \mathbb{R}) \oplus \mathrm{i}\mathcal{H}_0(\lambda_n; \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z})$ measures the induced metric of the unique m–pleated surface with bending locus λ_n, and the imaginary part measures its bending. In particular, $\mathcal{P}^\pm(\mu_n)$ locally corresponds to $\Phi_n^{-1}(\mathcal{H}_0(\lambda_n; \mathbb{R}) \oplus \mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}\mu_n)$, or more precisely to a branch of the immersion which is the composition of the projection $\mathcal{H}_0(\lambda_n; \mathbb{R}) \oplus \mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}\mu_n \to \mathcal{H}_0(\lambda_n; \mathbb{C}/2\pi\mathrm{i}\mathbb{Z})$ and of Φ_n^{-1}.

To compare the various $\mathcal{H}_0(\lambda_n; \mathbb{C}/2\pi\mathrm{i}\mathbb{Z})$ pick a train track τ carrying λ_0. Since λ_n converges to λ_0 for the Hausdorff topology, τ also carries the λ_n for n large enough. Then there is a well-defined isomorphism $\Psi_n : \mathcal{H}_0(\lambda_n; \mathbb{C}/2\pi\mathrm{i}\mathbb{Z}) \to$

$\mathcal{W}(\tau;\mathbb{C}/2\pi\mathrm{i}\mathbb{Z})$, where $\mathcal{W}(\tau;\mathbb{C}/2\pi\mathrm{i}\mathbb{Z})$ is the group of $\mathbb{C}/2\pi\mathrm{i}\mathbb{Z}$–valued edge weights for τ satisfying the switch and cusp relations.

Because λ_n converges to λ_0 for the Hausdorff topology, if follows from the explicit construction of [Bo1, §5, §8] that $\Phi_n^{-1}\circ\Psi_n^{-1}$ converges to $\Phi_0^{-1}\circ\Psi_0^{-1}$, uniformly on compact subsets of the image of $\Psi_0\circ\Phi_0$. Because these maps are holomorphic, the convergence is actually C^∞. Since μ_n converges to μ_0 for the topology of $\mathcal{ML}(S)$, the edge weight system $\Psi_n(\mu_n)$ converges to $\Psi_0(\mu_0)$ in $\mathcal{W}_0(\tau,\mathbb{R})$. It follows that $\mathcal{P}^\pm(\mu_n)$, which locally corresponds to $\Phi_n^{-1}\circ\Psi_n^{-1}\left(\mathcal{W}_0(\tau;\mathbb{R})\oplus\mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}\Psi_n(\mu_n)\right)$, converges to $\mathcal{P}^\pm(\mu_0)$, which locally corresponds to $\Phi_0^{-1}\circ\Psi_0^{-1}\left(\mathcal{W}_0(\tau;\mathbb{R})\oplus\mathrm{i}\mathbb{R}\Psi_0(\mu_0)\right)$, in the topology of C^∞–convergence on compact subsets. □

Note that we actually proved real analytic convergence in Lemma 12. However, we will only need C^2 convergence.

Theorem 13. *The subset $\check{U}$ is an open neighborhood of $\partial\check{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{ML}(S)$ in $\check{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{ML}(S)$, and $\check{\Phi}$ is a homeomorphism from $\check{U}$ to an open neighborhood $\check{V}$ of $\partial\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$ in $\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$.*

Proof. The restriction $\check{\Phi}_{\mu\nu}$ of $\check{\Phi}$ to $\check{R}_{\mu\nu}$ was constructed by considering the transverse intersection of the submanifolds $\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu)$ and $\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$ near the boundary of $\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$. By Lemma 12, $\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu)$ and $\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$ depend continuously on (μ,ν) for the topology of C^1 convergence. (Note that one needs the C^2 continuity of $\mathcal{P}^+(\mu)$ and $\mathcal{P}^-(\nu)$ to guarantee the C^1 continuity of $\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu)$ and $\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$ near the boundary.) It follows that the length $\varepsilon_{\mu\nu}$ of $R_{\mu\nu}=[0,\varepsilon_{\mu\nu}[\,(\mu,\nu)$ is a lower semi-continuous function of (μ,ν), and that $\Phi_{\mu\nu}$ depends continuously on (μ,ν). This proves that the union $\check{U}$ of the $\check{R}_{\mu\nu}$ is open in $\partial\check{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{ML}(S)$, and that $\check{\Phi}$ is continuous.

Let $p:\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)\to\mathcal{Q}(S)$ be the natural projection and, as usual, let $\beta:\mathcal{Q}(S)\to\mathcal{ML}(S)^2$ be the bending map. By construction, $\beta\circ p\circ\check{\Phi}$ is the identity map on $\check{U}-\partial\check{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{ML}(S)\subset\mathcal{ML}(S)^2$. It follows that $\check{\Phi}$ is injective on $\check{U}-\partial\check{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{ML}(S)$, and therefore on all of $\check{U}$ by Proposition 6.

The two spaces $\check{U}\subset\check{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{ML}(S)$ and $\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$ are topological manifolds-with-boundary of the same dimension 2θ. The map $\check{\Phi}:\check{U}\to\mathcal{FML}(S)$ is continuous and injective, and sends boundary points to boundary points. By the Theorem of Invariance of the Domain, it follows that its image $\check{V}=\check{\Phi}\big(\check{U}\big)$ is open in $\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$, and that $\check{\Phi}$ restricts to a homeomorphism $\check{U}\to\check{V}$. □

Theorem 14. *There exists an open neighborhood V of the fuchsian submanifold $\mathcal{F}(S)$ in $\mathcal{Q}(S)$ such that the bending map $\beta:\mathcal{Q}(S)\to\mathcal{ML}(S)^2$ induces a homeomorphism between $V-\mathcal{F}(S)$ and its image.*

Proof. For the canonical identifications between $\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)-\partial\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$ and $\mathcal{Q}(S)-\mathcal{F}(S)$, and between $\check{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{ML}(S)-\partial\check{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{ML}(S)$ and $\mathcal{FML}(S)$, the inverse of the restriction of $\check{\Phi}$ to $\check{U}-\partial\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)$ coincides with β. Therefore, the only part which requires some checking is that the image V of $\check{V}=\check{\Phi}\big(\check{U}\big)$ under the canonical projection $p:\check{\mathcal{Q}}(S)\to\mathcal{Q}(S)$ is open in $\mathcal{Q}(S)$. However, this immediately follows from the fact that the preimages of points under p are all compact, which implies that p is an open map. (Note that this is false for the projection $\check{\mathcal{F}}\mathcal{ML}(S)\to\mathcal{FML}(S)\cup\{0\}$.) □

Theorem 14 is just Theorem 1 stated in the introduction. Theorem 2 immediately follows from the definition of $\check{U}$ and from the fact that $\check{U}$ is open (Theorem 13).

We conclude with a few remarks.

A recent result of Caroline Series [Se2] shows that we can restrict the neighborhood V of Theorem 14 so that $\beta^{-1}(\beta(V)) = V$.

When μ and ν are multicurves, namely when their supports consist of finitely many closed geodesics, it follows from [HoK] that the submanifolds $\check{\mathcal{P}}^+(\mu)$ and $\check{\mathcal{P}}^-(\nu)$ are everywhere transverse, by a doubling argument as in [BoO]. Consequently, the open subset V of Theorem 14 can be chosen so that the image $U = \beta(V) \subset \mathcal{ML}(S)^2$ contains all rays of the form $[0, \infty[\,(\mu, \nu)$ where μ and ν are multicurves.

As indicated in the introduction, it is conjectured that we can take V equal to the whole space $\mathcal{Q}(S)$. See [BoO] for a characterization of the image of $\mathcal{Q}(S)$ under β.

References

[Bo1] Francis Bonahon, *Shearing hyperbolic surfaces, bending pleated surfaces and Thurston's symplectic form*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6) **5** (1996), pp. 233–297.

[Bo2] ———, *Geodesic laminations with transverse Hölder distributions*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **30** (1997), pp. 205–240.

[Bo3] ———, *The boundary geometry of* 3*–dimensional hyperbolic convex cores*, J. Differential Geometry **50** (1998), pp. 1–23.

[BoO] Francis Bonahon, Jean-Pierre Otal, *Laminations mesurées de plissage des variétés hyperboliques de dimension* 3, preprint, 2001.

[EpM] David B. A. Epstein, Albert Marden, *Convex hulls in hyperbolic spaces, a theorem of Sullivan, and measured pleated surfaces*, in: *Analytical and geometric aspects of hyperbolic space* (D.B.A. Epstein ed.), L.M.S. Lecture Note Series vol. **111**, 1986, Cambridge University Press, pp. 113–253.

[HoK] Craig D. Hodgson, Steven P. Kerckhoff, *Rigidity of hyperbolic cone-manifolds and hyperbolic Dehn surgery*, J. Differential Geom. **48** (1998), pp. 1–59.

[KaT] Yoshinobu Kamishima, Ser P. Tan, *Deformations spaces of geometric structures*, in: *Aspects of low-dimensional manifolds* (Y. Matsumo, S. Morita eds.), Advanced Studies in Pure Math. **20**, 1992, Kinokuniya Company Ltd., Tokyo, pp. 263–299.

[Ke1] Steven P. Kerckhoff, *The Nielsen realization problem*, Ann. of Math. **117** (1983), pp. 235–265.

[Ke2] ———, *Lines of minima in Teichmüller space*, Duke Math. J. **65** (1992), pp. 187–213.

[Mar] Albert Marden, *The geometry of finitely generated Kleinian groups*, Ann. of Math. **99** (1974), pp. 383–462.

[Mas] Bernard Maskit, *Kleinian groups*, Grundlehren der Math. Wiss. **287**, Springer-Verlag, 1988.

[Se1] Caroline M. Series, *On Kerckhoff minima and pleating loci for quasi-Fuchsian groups*, Geom. Dedicata **88** (2001), pp. 211–237.

[Se2] ———, *Limits of quasifuchsian groups with small bending*, preprint, 2002.

[Su] Dennis P. Sullivan, *Quasiconformal homeomorphisms and dynamics II: Structural stability implies hyperbolicity for Kleinian groups*, Acta Math. **155** (1985), pp. 243–260.

[Th1] William P. Thurston, *The topology and geometry of* 3*–manifolds*, Lecture notes, Princeton University, 1976–79.

[Th2] ———, *Earthquakes in two-dimensional hyperbolic geometry*, in: *Low-dimensional Topology and Kleinian groups* (D.B.A. Epstein ed.), L.M.S. Lecture Notes Series vol. **112**, 1986, Cambridge University press, pp. 91–112.

[Wo1] Scott A. Wolpert, *On the symplectic geometry of deformations of a hyperbolic surface*, Ann. of Math. **117** (1983), pp. 207–234.

[Wo2] ———, *Geodesic length functions and the Nielsen problem*, J. Differential Geom. **25** (1987), pp. 275–296.

F. Bonahon, Department of Mathematics, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90089-1113, U.S.A.

E-mail address: fbonahon@math.usc.edu

URL: http://math.usc.edu/~fbonahon